

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 14 through 21 and 31 through 38 are pending, with Claims 14, 18, 31, and 35 being independent. The independent claims, and Claim 20, have been amended. For support regarding the amendments, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to, e.g., the third embodiment (e.g., page 28, line 14 through page 29, line 22); of course, the claims are not limited to the disclosed embodiments.

Claims 14 through 21 and 31 through 38 were variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over US 2001/0048534 A1 (Tanaka, et al.), PIMA 15740:2000 PTP, US 5,541,656 (Kare, et al.), and US 6,055,361 (Fujita, et al.), with Claims 14 through 17 and 31 through 34 having been rejected over Tanaka, et al., PTP, and Kare, et al., and Claims 18 through 21 and 35 through 38 having been rejected over Tanaka, et al. and Fujita, et al. All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Turning first to *Claims 14 and 31*, those claims recite, *inter alia*, discarding the signal and controlling an issuing timing of a next command following the predetermined command to the recording apparatus while waiting for the response to the predetermined command, in a case where it is determined that the signal is not the response to the predetermined command (where the recording apparatus preferentially processes a command received from the image supply device even if the recording apparatus waits for a response from the image supply device).

However, Applicants respectfully submit that none of Tanaka, et al., PTP, and Kare, et al., even in the proposed combinations, assuming, *arguendo*, that such could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 14 and 31. Applicants respectfully submit that Tanaka, et al. discloses, e.g., that the data receiving device requests an image file from the data

transmitting device, the data transmitting device transmits the image file, and the data receiving device prints the image in the print condition shown in the print file. PTP is relied upon in the Official Action for showing, e.g., push or pull mode. Applicants respectfully submit that Kare, et al. discloses, e.g., that after sending a packet, the camera waits for AC, NAK, CAN, or BREAK before processing any other communication, and any other character will be ignored/discarded (e.g., col. 12, lines 56-60). However, Applicants respectfully submit that neither the foregoing nor the remainder of the aforementioned documents provides either a description or suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 14 and 31. Also, Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion at page 4 of the Official Action that controlling the issuing timing as claimed is inherently disclosed in the cited documents, since inherency requires that the claimed feature must invariably be present, which is not the case.

Turning next to **Claims 18 and 35**, those claims recite, *inter alia*, sending a response to the command to the image supply device after completion of the processing of the command and controlling an issuing timing of the predetermined command to the image supply device after sending of the response to the command, in a case where it is determined that the signal is the command other than the response (wherein the image supply device discards a signal received other than a response from the recording apparatus while waiting for the response from the recording apparatus).

However, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Tanaka, et al. nor Fujita, et al., even in the proposed combination, assuming, *arguendo*, that such could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 18 and 35. Tanaka, et al. has been discussed above, and Applicants respectfully submit that Fujita, et al. discloses, e.g., executing a second command in preference to a first command; however, Applicants respectfully submit that Tanaka, et al. and Fujita, et al.

are silent as to the above-discussed claimed features. In this regard, the assertion in the Official Action that said features are “necessarily” present in the cited documents is respectfully traversed.

Applicants further respectfully submit that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 14, 18, 31, and 35.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants’ undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Attorney for Applicants
Daniel S. Glueck
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSC/mcm

FCIS_WS 1466791v1